UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/763,162	01/26/2004	Naoyuki Nagao	1713.1010	6723

21171 7590 09/12/2007

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER	
MIRZADEGAN, SAEED S	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2144	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/12/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/763,162	NAGAO, NAOYUKI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Saeed S. Mirzadegan	2144	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 January 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-32* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-32* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *26 January 2004* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *01/26/2004*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The certified copy has been filed in Japanese parent Application No. 2003-022948, filed on 01/31/2003.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 01/26/2004 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Drawings

3. Figure 1 as well as many other figures mentioned in the specification should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

4. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

5. The following title is suggested: System, Method and Computer Program for a Console Switch.

6. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The disclosure recites the phrase "face each other".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. **Claim 15** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 15, recites the limitation "bus-connected". Neither the specification nor the claim provides any detail as to the method of connection in bus topology for the console switch. As per the specification, the console

switch has a plurality of terminal ports, and a conventional device port. There is no mention of how the ports are to be connected and figure 30 accounts for connection of only one port.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention

8. **Claims 1-32** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

9. **Claims 1, 13, 16, 17 & 25** recite the limitation "obtains port information" in line 7 of claim 1, & line 18 of claim 13, & line 8 of claim 16, & line 22 of claim 17, & line 7 of claim 25. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims. It is not clear to examiner which port among the plurality of ports does the phrase "port" refer to.

10. **Claims 1, 13, 16, 17 & 25** recite the limitation "port". It is not clear weather the recited term indicates a hardware port or software port.

11. **Claim 16** recites the limitation "face each other", on page 41, line 1. Neither the claim nor the specification, explain or make clear what is meant by this phrase. Usage of the phrase "face each other" renders the claim incomprehensible.

12. Since the independent **claims 1, 13, 16, 17 & 25** are rejected under 35 U.S.C 112 2nd, all of the depending claims from these claims are also rejected based on their dependencies.

13. Insofar as best understood, the claims are rejected over prior art as follows. For the sake of applying the closest prior art below, the term "port information" is being interpreted as meaning "information". If the applicant agrees with this interpretation they are invited to amend the claims to positively recite, "information" or if the applicant disagrees, the applicant should present an alternate interpretation with clear arguments.

14. Insofar as best understood, the claims are rejected over prior art as follows. For the sake of applying the closest prior art below, the term "face each other" is being interpreted as meaning "connected to each other". If the applicant agrees with this interpretation they are invited to amend the claims to positively recite, "connected to each other" or if the applicant disagrees, the applicant should present an alternate interpretation with clear arguments.

15. **Claim 2** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

16. **Claim 2** recites the limitation "a third unit that automatically connects to each port of the information processing device after activation", on page 38, lines 17-19. Neither the claim nor the specification, explain or make clear after activation of what? Applicant needs to clarify the association of activation with the device.

17. **Claim 3** recites the limitation " a fourth unit that, after activation", on page 38, line 22. Neither the claim nor the specification, explain or make clear after activation of what? Applicant needs to clarify the association of activation with the device.

18. Dependent **Claim 31** recites the limitation "The information transmission device" page 44, lines 21-22. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

19. Insofar as best understood, the claims are rejected over prior art as follows. For the sake of applying the closest prior art below, the term "The information transmission device" is being interpreted as meaning "the information processing device". If the applicant agrees with this interpretation they are invited to amend the claims to

positively recite, "the information processing device" or if the applicant disagrees, the applicant should present an alternate interpretation with clear arguments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

20. **Claims 1, 5, 13, 17, 18, 21, 25, 26, 29** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants Admitted Prior Art (hereafter "AAPA") in view of Nagaraj (US Pat. No. 6947415) hereafter "Nagaraj".

21. Regarding **Claim 1**, AAPA discloses, **(Fig 1 & background)** a console switch that selectively connects a terminal to a port of an information processing device that has a plurality of ports connected through a network, the console switch comprising:

(Fig 2) a first unit that obtains port information from the terminal, the port information specifying the port, and establishes a connection path between the terminal and the port of the information processing device. However AAPA does not explicitly teach a second unit that refers to a predetermined database in accordance with the port information obtained by the first unit.

22. In the same field of endeavor, Nagaraj teaches **(Abstract lines 3-6 & Fig 2, 240)** a routing table that is maintained by **(Abstract lines 3-6 & Fig 2, 260)** a processing unit, which is the functional equivalent of second unit claimed in claim 1 above.

23. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the applicant's invention was made to combine Nagaraj's teaching of routine table which is maintained by a routing processing unit with the teachings of AAPA, for the purpose of **(see Nagaraj, Col. 1, Lines 34-37)** increasing the speed of a routing switch while decreasing the internal complexity of the component communications. AAPA provides motivation to do so, by connecting the terminal to different servers to be able to TELNET to them **(see applicant background of invention, Page 4, Line 31-32 & Page 5, lines 7-8)**.

24. Regarding **Claim 5**, AAPA and Nagaraj substantially disclose the console switch as claimed in claim 1. AAPA further discloses **(Fig 6 & background)** a notification

message, which shows when a connection to the terminal has been established which is the functional equivalent of the fifth element.

25. Regarding **Claim 13**, AAPA discloses, **(Fig 1 & background)** a system comprising: **(Fig. 1, 701)** a terminal; **(Fig.1, 710)** an information processing device that has a plurality of ports **(Fig.1, 100)** a console switch that selectively connects a terminal to a port of an information processing device that has a plurality of ports connected through a network, the console switch comprising: **(Fig 2)** a first unit that obtains port information from the terminal, the port information specifying the port, and establishes a connection path between the terminal and the port of the information processing device. However AAPA does not explicitly teach a second unit that refers to a predetermined database in accordance with the port information obtained by the first unit.

26. In the same field of endeavor, Nagaraj teaches **(Abstract lines 3-6 & Fig 2, 240)** a routing table that is maintained by **(Abstract lines 3-6 & Fig 2, 260)** a processing unit, which is the functional equivalent of second unit claimed in claim 1 above.

27. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the applicant's invention was made to combine Nagaraj's teaching of routine table which is maintained by a routing processing unit with the teachings of AAPA, for the purpose of **(see Nagaraj, Col. 1, Lines 34-37)** increasing the speed of a routing switch while decreasing the internal complexity of the component communications. AAPA

provides motivation to do so, by connecting the terminal to different servers to be able to TELNET to them **(see applicant background of invention, Page 4, Line 31-32 & Page 5, lines 7-8)**.

28. **Claim 17** list all the same elements of claim 1, but in method form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 1 applies equally as well to claim 17.

29. **Claim 18** list all the same elements of claim 2, but in method form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 2 applies equally as well to claim 18.

30. **Claim 21** list all the same elements of claim 5, but in method form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 5 applies equally as well to claim 21.

31. **Claim 25** list all the same elements of claim 1, but in computer program product form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 1 applies equally as well to claim 25.

32. **Claim 26** list all the same elements of claim 2, but in computer program product form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 2 applies equally as well to claim 26.

33. **Claim 29** list all the same elements of claim 5, but in computer program product form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 5 applies equally as well to claim 29.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

34. **Claims 3, 4, 6, 12, 14, 16, 19, 20, 22, 24, 27, 28, 30, 32** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA - Nagaraj, as applied to claims 1,13, 17, 25 above and in further view of Duvvury (US Pat. No. 6917626) hereafter "Duvvury".

35. Regarding **Claim 3,** AAPA and Nagaraj substantially disclose the console switch as claimed in claim 1 above. However AAPA and Nagaraj do not explicitly teach a fourth unit that, after activation, obtains the MAC address and the IP address of the information processing device, associate the MAC address and the IP address of the information processing device with the port information, and stores the MAC address and the IP address associated with the port information in the predetermined database.

36. In the same field of endeavor, Duvvury teaches **(Col. 4, lines 11-15 & Fig. 2B)** learning the MAC address and storing it in the memory, **(Col. 9, lines 6-8)** poll devices on the network for specific information.

37. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the applicant's invention was made to combine Duvvury's teaching of learning specific information from devices on the network as such as MAC address and storing it in memory with the teachings of AAPA & Nagaraj, for the purpose of **(see Duvvury, Col. 6, Lines 46-50)** to allow management of all the network devices in a cluster using a single IP address. AAPA provides motivation to do so, by connecting the terminal to different servers to be able to TELNET to them **(see applicant background of invention, Page 4, Line 31-32 & Page 5, lines 7-8)**.

38. Regarding **Claim 4,** AAPA and Nagaraj substantially disclose the console switch as claimed in claim 1 above. However AAPA and Nagaraj do not explicitly teach when a connection path has not yet been established between the terminal and the port of the information processing device corresponding to the port information obtained by the first unit, the second unit detects the IP address from the MAC address of the information processing device corresponding to the obtained port information.

39. In the same field of endeavor, Duvvury teaches **(Col. 4, lines 11-15 & Fig. 2B)** learning the MAC address and storing it in the memory, **(Col. 9, lines 6-8)** poll devices on the network for specific information.

40. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the applicant's invention was made to combine Duvvury's teaching of obtaining specific information from devices on the network such as MAC address with the teachings of AAPA & Nagaraj, for the purpose of **(see Duvvury, Col. 6, Lines 46-50)** to allow management of all the network devices in a cluster using a single IP address. AAPA provides motivation to do so, by connecting the terminal to different servers to be able to TELNET to them **(see applicant background of invention, Page 4, Line 31-32 & Page 5, lines 7-8)**.

41. Regarding **Claim 6,** AAPA and Nagaraj substantially disclose the console switch as claimed in claim 1 above. However AAPA and Nagaraj do not explicitly teach the port information includes a port number allocated to the port of the information processing device, or a port name allocated to the port of the information processing device.

42. In the same field of endeavor, Duvvury teaches **(Col. 9, lines 6-8)** poll devices on the network for specific information.

43. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the applicant's invention was made to combine Duvvury's teaching of polling the devices for specific information with the teachings of AAPA & Nagaraj, for the purpose of **(see Duvvury, Col. 6, Lines 46-50)** to allow management of all the network devices in a cluster using a single IP address. AAPA provides motivation to do so, by connecting the terminal to different servers to be able to TELNET to them **(see applicant background of invention, Page 4, Line 31-32 & Page 5, lines 7-8)**.

44. Regarding **Claim 12**, the same limitation is addressed in claim 3 above. The same grounds of rejection apply to claim 12 as was applied to claim 3. The tuning button manually performs the same task as was performed in claim 3.

45. Regarding **Claim 14,** AAPA and Nagaraj substantially disclose the console switch as claimed in claim 13. However AAPA and Nagaraj do not explicitly teach the information processing device is cascade-connected

46. In the same field of endeavor, Duvvury teaches **(Col. 5, lines 45-46 & 50-51 & Fig. 4)** two cascaded console switches.

47. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the applicant's invention was made to combine Duvvury's teaching of cascading console switches with the teachings of AAPA & Nagaraj, for the purpose of **(see**

Duvvury, Col. 6, Lines 46-50) to allow management of all the network devices in a cluster using a single IP address. AAPA provides motivation to do so, by connecting the terminal to different servers to be able to TELNET to them **(see applicant background of invention, Page 4, Line 31-32 & Page 5, lines 7-8)**.

48. Regarding **Claim 16,** AAPA and Nagaraj substantially disclose the console switch as claimed in claim 16. However AAPA and Nagaraj do not teach a system comprising: a first console switch; and a second console switch that is connected to the first console switch through a network in such a manner that the first console switch and the second console switch face each other.

49. In the same field of endeavor, Duvvury teaches **(Col. 5, lines 45-46 & 50-51 & Fig. 4)** two cascaded console switches.

50. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the applicant's invention was made to combine Duvvury's teaching of cascading console switches with the teachings of AAPA & Nagaraj, for the purpose of **(see Duvvury, Col. 6, Lines 46-50)** to allow management of all the network devices in a cluster using a single IP address. AAPA provides motivation to do so, by connecting the terminal to different servers to be able to TELNET to them **(see applicant background of invention, Page 4, Line 31-32 & Page 5, lines 7-8)**.

51. **Claim 19** list all the same elements of claim 3, but in method form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 3 applies equally as well to claim 19.

52. **Claim 20** list all the same elements of claim 4, but in method form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 4 applies equally as well to claim 20.

53. **Claim 22** list all the same elements of claim 6, but in method form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 6 applies equally as well to claim 22.

54. **Claim 24** list all the same elements of claim 3, but in method form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 3 applies equally as well to claim 24.

55. **Claim 27** list all the same elements of claim 3, but in computer program product form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 3 applies equally as well to claim 27.

56. **Claim 28** list all the same elements of claim 3, but in computer program product form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 3 applies equally as well to claim 28.

57. **Claim 30** list all the same elements of claim 6, but in computer program product form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 6 applies equally as well to claim 30.

58. **Claim 32** list all the same elements of claim 3, but in computer program product form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 3 applies equally as well to claim 32.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

59. **Claims 7-11, 23, 31** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA - Nagaraj as applied to Claims 1,17,25 and further in view of North et al. (US Pat. No. 6505245) hereafter "North".

60. Regarding **Claim 7,** AAPA and Nagaraj substantially disclose the console switch as claimed in claim 1 above. However AAPA and Nagaraj do not explicitly teach the predetermined database is managed as a text file.

61. In the same field of endeavor, North teaches **(Col. 2, lines 57-61)** the information maintained in the memory of the devices, is kept as text string.

62. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the applicant's invention was made to combine North's teaching of memory maintaining the information in a text form with the teachings of AAPA & Nagaraj, for the purpose of **(see North, Col. 2, Lines 31-35)** to enable a system administrator to manage disparate manageable devices form a single location. AAPA provides motivation to do so, by connecting the terminal to different servers to be able to TELNET to them **(see applicant background of invention, Page 4, Line 31-32 & Page 5, lines 7-8)**.

63. Regarding **Claim 8,** AAPA and Nagaraj substantially disclose the console switch as claimed in claim 1 above. However AAPA and Nagaraj do not explicitly teach a memory unit that stores transmission and reception data generated between the terminal and the port of the information processing device.

64. In the same field of endeavor, North teaches **(Fig. 5, 124 & abstract lines 9-10)** the memory subsystem capable of storing logs of all accesses and actions performed on the computing devices in the allocated space 124.

65. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the applicant's invention was made to combine North's teaching of the memory location for storing logs with the teachings of AAPA & Nagaraj, for the purpose of **(see North, Col. 2, Lines 31-35)** to enable a system administrator to manage disparate manageable devices form a single location. AAPA provides motivation to do so, by connecting the terminal to different servers to be able to TELNET to them **(see applicant background of invention, Page 4, Line 31-32 & Page 5, lines 7-8)**.

66. Regarding **Claim 9,** AAPA and Nagaraj and North substantially disclose the console switch as claimed in claim 8 above. North further discloses **(Fig. 5, 124 & abstract lines 9-10)** the memory subsystem capable of storing logs of all accesses and actions performed on the computing devices to be outputted onto a screen of the terminal.

67. Regarding **Claim 10,** AAPA and Nagaraj and North substantially disclose the console switch as claimed in claim 8 above. North further discloses **(Fig. 5, 124 & abstract lines 9-10)** the memory subsystem capable of storing logs of all accesses and actions performed on the computing devices to be outputted onto a screen of the terminal.

68. Regarding **Claim 11,** AAPA and Nagaraj and North substantially disclose the console switch as claimed in claim 8 above. North further discloses **(Fig. 5, 124 &**

abstract lines 9-10) the memory subsystem capable of storing logs of all accesses and actions performed on the computing devices to be outputted onto a screen of the terminal.

69. **Claim 23** list all the same elements of claim 8, but in method form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 8 applies equally as well to claim 23.

70. **Claim 31** list all the same elements of claim 8, but in computer program product form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 8 applies equally as well to claim 31.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

71. **Claims 2, 15** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA - Nagaraj as applied to Claims 1, 13 above and further in view of Gallagher et al. (US PG Pub. No. 2003/0002492) hereafter "Gallagher".

72. Regarding **Claim 2,** AAPA and Nagaraj substantially disclose the console switch as claimed in claim 1. However AAPA and Nagaraj do not explicitly teach a third unit that automatically connects to each port of the information processing device after activation.

73. In the same field of endeavor, Gallagher teaches **(Page 1, ¶0003, lines 4-15)** a switch is a device capable of providing on demand, anything-to-anything connections between attached devices. A switch typically provides a number of ports to which external devices may attach. The switch provides the ability to dynamically connect any port to any other port, thereby enabling any attached device to communicate with any other attached device. Switches may be used to accomplish direct connections between devices, or switches may be combined in cascaded or chained topologies in order to increase the total number of ports within the network, or to increase the allowable physical distance between connected devices, which is the functional equivalent of the third unit.

74. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the applicant's invention was made to combine Gallagher's teaching of a switches ability to provide connectivity between ports of devices connected to it with the teachings of AAPA & Nagaraj, for the purpose of **(see Gallagher, Page 2, ¶0008, lines 3-6)** to enable enabling a switch to provide to a requesting device sufficient information for the requesting device to determine the specific ports for which the requesting device should update its local port configuration data. AAPA provides motivation to do so, by connecting the terminal to different servers to be able to TELNET to them **(see applicant background of invention, Page 4, Line 31-32 & Page 5, lines 7-8)**.

75. Regarding **Claim 15,** AAPA and Nagaraj substantially disclose the console switch as claimed in claim 13. However AAPA and Nagaraj do not explicitly teach the console switch is bus-connected to the network.

76. In the same field of endeavor, Gallagher teaches **(Page 1, ¶0003, lines 4-15)** Switches may be used to accomplish direct connections between devices, or switches may be combined in cascaded or chained topologies in order to increase the total number of ports within the network, or to increase the allowable physical distance between connected devices which is the functional equivalent of the third unit.

77. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the applicant's invention was made to combine Gallagher's teaching of different ways switches can be combined with the teachings of AAPA & Nagaraj, for the purpose of **(see Gallagher, Page 2, ¶0008, lines 3-6)** enabling a switch to provide to a requesting device sufficient information for the requesting device to determine the specific ports for which the requesting device should update its local port configuration data. AAPA provides motivation to do so, by connecting the terminal to different servers to be able to TELNET to them **(see applicant background of invention, Page 4, Line 31-32 & Page 5, lines 7-8)**.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Please refer to form PTO-892 (Notice of Reference Cited) for a list of relevant prior art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Saeed S. Mirzadegan whose telephone number is 571-270-3044. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Vaughn can be reached on 571-272-3922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SSM

WILLIAM VAUGHN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100